

Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated October 14, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 16, 2004

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 11, 12, and 21 remain pending.  
Claim 22 is new. Claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 11, and 21 are each  
5 currently amended. Claims 2, 7 through 10, and 13 through 20  
have been canceled.

Claim 20 is objected to because of informalities. This  
objection is moot in that Claim 20 has been canceled.

10

"Claims 1-2, 4-7 and 9-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.  
103(e) as being anticipated by Ogino (US Patent #6,762,794)."  
Also, "Claims 3 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as  
being unpatentable over Ogino (US Patent #6,762,794)." As  
15 will be discussed below, the claims as now presented are not  
anticipated or made obvious by the teachings of Ogino.

Claim 1 (currently amended) is now claiming from amongst  
other elements -- . . . stereo imaging means . . . including: a  
20 camera; and set of mirrors angled with respect to each other  
at a predetermined angle relative to a common plane  
intersecting said camera, each mirror having adjacent ends  
disposed a predetermined distance from the camera along the

Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated October 14, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 16, 2004

common plane, for directing light from an object reflected in  
said mirrors directly to the camera, for producing a stereo  
effect in the output of the camera --. As shown in Figure 10  
of Ogino, and as taught therein, Ogino does not teach the use  
5 of a camera and a set of mirrors as claimed in Claim 1  
(currently amended). For example, the mirrors 1107 and 1112  
of Ogino are not arranged for directing light from an object  
directly to a camera, nor are the mirrors angled with respect  
to each other along a common plane intersecting the camera, as  
10 now claimed. Clearly, Claim 1 (currently amended) is now  
claiming a combination of elements for a stereo camera system  
that is completely different than that of Ogino. According,  
Claim 1 (currently amended) is patentable.

15 Claims 3 through 5, each as currently amended are now  
dependent from Claim 1 (currently amended), dependent Claim 6  
dependent from Claim 5 and ultimately dependent from Claim 1  
(currently amended), and Claim 11 (currently amended) to  
depend from Claim 1, are each patentable for at least the same  
20 reasons as Claim 1 (currently amended).

Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated October 14, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 16, 2004

Claim 21 (currently amended) is now claiming the following:

A method for adjusting a stereo camera system to control spatial resolution of an object of interest in the field of view of a stereo imaging means, the method comprising the steps of:

outputting at least one image from the stereo imaging means;

locating an object of interest in the field of view of the stereo imaging means and at least one of the distance of the object of interest from the stereo imaging means and the size of the object of interest;

automatically changing at least one system parameter which affects the spatial resolution of the object of interest based on at least one of the located distance of the object of interest from the stereo imaging means and the size of the object of interest; and

providing said stereo imaging means by further including the steps of:

using a camera to receive light from said object; establishing a predetermined angle between a set of mirrors, the angle being relative to a common plane intersecting said camera, and adjacent ends of said mirrors; and

establishing a predetermined distance from the camera and the adjacent ends of said mirrors for reflecting light from said object from mirrors to said

Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated October 14, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 16, 2004

camera, for producing a stereo effect in the output of  
the camera.

Claim 21 (currently amended) is claiming a combination of  
5 steps for a method for adjusting a stereo camera system not  
anticipated or made obvious by Ogino. More specifically,  
Ogino teaches away from such a combination of steps, and  
particularly does not show or in any way suggest the steps of  
-- . . . establishing a predetermined angle between a set of  
10 mirrors, the angle being relative to a common plane  
intersecting said camera and adjacent ends of said mirrors;  
and establishing a predetermined distance from the camera and  
the adjacent ends of said mirrors for reflecting light from  
said object from said mirrors to said camera, for producing a  
15 stereo effect in the output of the camera. --. Accordingly,  
Claim 21 (currently amended) is patentable over Ogino.

New Claim 22 is claiming a stereo camera system that  
comprises a plurality of elements not found in Ogino, or made  
20 obvious by Ogino. For example, Claim 22 is claiming from  
amongst these elements -- . . . adjusting means comprises:

angle adjustment means for adjusting the  
predetermined angle of at least one of the two cameras;

Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated October 14, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 16, 2004

baseline adjustment means for adjusting the  
predetermined distance between the two cameras;

distance adjusting means for adjusting a distance  
between at least one of the two cameras and the object of  
5 interest; and

focal length adjustment means for changing a focal  
length of at least one of the two cameras. --.

As taught in column 5, lines 40 through 47, referred to by the  
Examiner, Ogino does teach the use of an "unshown mechanism"  
10 for adjusting the angle between the optical system's 101/103  
and 102/104, and the distance therebetween, **but Ogino does not  
teach the use of - - . . distance adjusting means for  
adjusting a distance between at least one of the two cameras  
and the object of interest. . . --, nor the use of - - . . .**  
15 **focal length adjustment means for changing a focal length of  
at least one of the two cameras. -- As called for in Claim  
22. Accordingly, Claim 22 is patentable over Ogino.**

The undersigned would like to bring to the Examiner's  
20 attention case law that clearly advises why Ogino does not  
make Applicants' invention as claimed obvious. The courts have  
long held that there must be some teaching in the references  
cited to suggest the combination of the references in a manner  
to obtain the combination of elements of the rejected  
25 claim(s). It is well known that in order for any prior art  
references themselves to be validly combined for use in a

Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated October 14, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 16, 2004

prior-art § 103 rejection, the references themselves, or some other prior art, must suggest that they be combined. For example:

5           The Board has stated in Ex parte Levengood, 28 USPQ 2d 1300 (PTOBA&I 1993):

10           "In order to establish prima facie case of obviousness, it is necessary for the examiner to present evidence, preferably in the form of some teaching, suggestion, incentive or inference in the applied prior art, or in the form of generally available knowledge, that one having ordinary skill in the art would have been led to combine the relevant

15           teachings of the applied references in the proposed manner to arrive at the claimed invention. ... That which is within the capabilities of one skilled in the art is not synonymous with obviousness. ...That one can reconstruct and/or explain the theoretical

20           mechanism of an invention by means of logic and sound scientific reasoning does not afford the basis for an obviousness conclusion unless that logic and reasoning also supplies sufficient impetus to have led one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the teachings of

25           the references to make the claimed invention.... Our reviewing courts have often advised the Patent and Trademark Office that it can satisfy the burden establishing a prima facie case of obviousness only by showing some objective teaching in either the prior

30           art, or knowledge generally available to one of

Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated October 14, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 16, 2004

5 ordinary skill in the art, that 'would lead' that individual 'to combine the relevant teachings of the references which describe various aspects of a patent applicant's invention without also providing evidence of a motivating force which would impel one skilled in the art to do what the patent applicant has done."

10 As was further stated in Uniroyal, Inc. v Rudkin-Wiley Corp., 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1434 (C.A.F.C. 1988),

15 "where prior art references require selective combination by the court to render obvious a subsequent invention, there must be some reason for the combination other than hindsight gleaned from the invention itself .... Something in the prior art must suggest the desirability and thus the obviousness of making the combination."

20 Also, the case law is clear in guarding against the use of hindsight in reading Applicants invention into the prior art, which art is clearly not disclosing the Applicants invention as claimed. Applicants would like to bring the following cases to the Examiner's attention:

25 The Supreme Court in Calmar, Inc. v. Cook Chemical Co., 383 U.S. 1, 86 S.Ct. 684, 15 L.Ed.2d 545 (1966), in which the Court warns the dangers of "slipping into hindsight", citing the case of Monroe Auto Equipment Co. v. Heckethorn Mfg. & Supply Co., 332 F.2d 406, 141  
30 U.S.P.Q. 549 (6th Cir., 1964), where the doctrine is

Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated October 14, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 16, 2004

stated:

5 We now come to the patented device which after all is  
the subject matter of this case. At the outset we  
take note of two well-established principles. The  
first is that in considering the questions of  
obviousness, we must view the prior art from the point  
in time prior to when the patented device was made.  
Many things may seem obvious after they have been made  
10 and for this reason courts should guard against  
slipping into use of hindsight. We must be careful to  
"view the prior art without reading into that art the  
teachings of appellant's invention." Application of  
Sporck, 301 F.2d 686, 689 (C.C.P.A).

15

Applicants have reviewed the references cited by the  
Examiner but not replied upon, and believe that the teachings  
of these references whether taken individually or in any  
combination with one another or with the references relied  
20 upon by the Examiner, do not anticipate or make obvious the  
claims as now presented. Accordingly, the present invention  
as now claimed is free of all of the cited references.



Appl. No. 09/808,377  
Amdt. Dated October 14, 2004  
Reply to Office Action of August 16, 2004

The claims as now presented are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the claims be allowed and the case passed on to issue.

5

Respectfully submitted,



10

Kenneth Watov, Esquire  
Registration No. 26,042  
Attorney for Applicants

15

Please Address All Correspondence to:

Gregory L. Thorne, Esq., Reg. No. 39,398  
Philips Intellectual Property & Standards  
20 P.O. Box 3001  
Briarcliff Manor, NY 10510  
(914) 945-6000

25

30

35

12311021.AMD